1880-81 File no. 10
F.L.R.I Serial no. 1-A.

Sub: Directs that Rangapura may continue to hold Shanbhogaru office of Kodachadli in Hobali Bahur Taluk for 5 years and after which period the Ramachandraiah to be the Shanbhogaru of the disputed Shanbhogaru be appointed.

G. R. S. 58
Previous references.

File No. 10

1880-81

Serial Nos. 1-9

(L. R.)

Later references.

LR 17-84
57382-02

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

B/

Serial Nos.

Part B. for

SUBJECT.

Orders that Lakshmi may continue to hold Shanbogue office of Kodaballi on lease holding Kiar for 5 years & after which, Smt Ramachandrabai, the mother of the deceased Shanbogue be appointed Shanbogue.

(For Table of contents, see within)

GPB ..8,000—7-4-07

L.F. 10 of 1880-81

Shanbhog office of Kodahalli, Udagur Hobli, Belur Taluk.

1. From Rangappa, late Shanbhog of Kodahally.
Pet.No.410 D/ 23rd May 1881.
Appeals against the order of dismissal passed against him by the D.C.Hassan on account of certain clerical errors discovered in his accounts.

2. From Ramachandriah, Shanbhog of Kodahally.
Pet.No.604 Dated 12th June 1881.
States that he has been removed from the Shanbhogi office being represented by the Shekdar as being incompetent and that the appointment has been given to one Honappa, the brother of the Shanbhog of Adagur.

3. From Rangiah, Shanbhog of Kodahally.
Pet.No.607 dated 14th June 1881.
Begs that pending disposal of his appeal the appointment of the petitioner's brother Ramachandrappa be not disturbed.

4. From Ramachadriah, Shanbhog of Kodahally.
Pet.No.1072 dated 25th July 1881.
States that he has not handed over charge of the Shanbhogi office, that he is threatened with criminal prosecution and begs that he may be confirmed in the office on perusal of his petition of 18th June last.

5. To the D.C.Hassan. O.M.No. 8099/331 D/ 17-9-1881.
Forwards serials 2,3,& 4 for report.

6. From the Deputy Comm^r, Hassan.

No. 1883/572 dated 20th October 1881.

Submits report on the petition from Rungappa, late Shanbhog of Kodahally firka in the Adagur Hobli of the Belur Taluk, praying to restore him to the said Shanbhogi.

7. From the same. No. 1934/580 dated 27-10-1881.

Returns enclosures sent with petitions from Rungappa, and states that the petitioner's case has been reported upon in the above.

8. To the same. No. 255/54 dated 26th April 1882.

Passes orders that the present shanbhog Soorappa will continue to hold office for a period of 5 years after which the petitioner Ramachandriah the brother of the dismissed shanbhog and the next claimant to the office should be appointed to it.

9. To Ramachandriah, Shanbhog of Kodahally.

Endt No. 604, 1072 and 410 dated 9th May 1882.

Informs him that instructions have been issued to the Deputy Comm^r, Hassan as in the above.

B Serials 1 to 9

(General Serial No. 32)

188 , 82.

No. 1.11

Name of Petitioner. [illegible]

Village. Kalgar

Taluk. Belur

District. Kaccan

Date of Arzi. 23. 5. 81

Date of Receipt. 23. 5. 81

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. one

ABSTRACT.

[illegible]

No. 2410
Despatched 4-5-88

COURT FEE ONE RUPEE COURT FEE ONE RUPEE

No 1
To
The Dewan
to His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore

For Transfer
Jaw Respecting
Inl. Case

23-5-88

Respected Sir,

I Rungappah Shanbogh of Kodihally of Hulgur Hobli of the Bellur Taluq Kasaba District most respectfully beg to submit the following to your honor trusting to be favored for investigation -

That already Reports of this said village have prepared a complaint to the effect that an excess amount of Cranage was demanded by me from them. The Assistant Commissioner of the District has enquired into the charges of the complaint and assessing it as groundless of grave) - During the trial of the said 2 cases, it was found a clerical error in the Receipt Book - although it was proved that it was inadvertently yet the Assistant Commissioner recommended my amount from the Ryots

I respectfully beg to obtain that Sanctioning the said Shanbogs Office from the last 10 years Increase not have committed no fault in collection of clerical error such as this was found I passed the Assistant Commissioner that the amount of Rs 1 that many Ryots there from my amount from the Ryots which I retained to me to refund no notice has been received I attended to the said Office

I further beg to state that accepted to the existing Peramane Rules, the receiving of

(General Serial No.) 188

No. ~~295~~ 534.

Name of Petitioner. Ramachandra Rao

Village. Kadiluddy

Taluk. Kolar

District. Kolar

Date of Arzi. 12. 6. 84.

Date of Receipt. 21. 6. 84.

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. Nil

ABSTRACT.

Drawing attention to the petition of the said petitioner stating that his brother having been dismissed the Kadiyaly Office in enquiring into the petitioner. On the Representation however the petitioner also was removed on the ground incompetency. The appointment has been given to a stranger and the petitioner who was the Karnam of the village for

COURT FEE
TWO RUPEES

No. 604

(General Serial No. 12.)

188 7. / 82.

No. 607.

Name of Petitioner. Ranjid Khanbay &

Village. Kodakeli

Taluk. Gairlai

District. Kaira

Date of Arzi. 14. 6. 87.

Date of Receipt. 21. 6. 87.

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. Nil

ABSTRACT.

Drawing attention to the petition of the 22nd May last praying for removal from the Mamlatdarship office station and the Karbhari is directed to advise the petitioner further in the matter and informing the applicant immediately that finally disposed of. Append the applicant's petition.

To Deputy Commr
for report
C

(General Serial No. 32.)

No. 1884

No. 1972.

Name of Petitioner. Ramachandra

Village. Kavitkatte Putta

Taluk. Belur

District. Hassan

Date of Arzi. 25/

Date of Receipt. 28 July 91

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. Nil.

ABSTRACT.

States that his brother Ramajah was removed from his shanbhogue by the Deputy Commr at the request of Mr Thickness (Assistant Commissioner) & alleges that he was doing the duty for himself & agent some stranger was appointed to the office by the Assistant on the recommendation

B.

Oct 2
(09

COURT FEE
INDIA
ONE RUPEE
INVORUPEES

No. 1072
4-5-55

No. 5092 / 331 (3)

Mysore Chief Commissioner's Office.

Official Memorandum.

The accompanying Petition No. 604 (607 & 1072), dated 12 & 14 June & 25 July 81 received at the Chief Commissioner's Office from Devanna's Sowcar & Revenue Officer Gubbi (Petition Copy) & Amildar Tiptur & Sheristadar Office

Papers are forwarded, together with its enclosures to the Deputy Commissioner & the Revenue Officer Gubbi for report & early disposal of the Petition No 328 & 251 dated 20 July 1881.

BANGALORE,
21 September 1881.

"By Order,"

Secretary.



(General Serial No. 29.)

OFFICE OF THE
DEWAN OF MYSORE.

188 .

From The Deputy Commissioner
Kaira District

To

The Secretary to the ~~Chief Commissioner~~ Dewan
of Mysore Revenue Department.

Dated 20th October 1881

Despatched

Received

Enclosures No. 3 & Receipt

General No. 1881—82
No.

Submitting Report on the Famine Relief Works executed in Kaira District during the late Scarcity, Statement of Expenditure and Receipts, Public Works Account, Famine Relief Account, and Receipts realized during the said Scarcity.—

31.10.81
Rd
Recd
Subs with Dno 634
R

Submitted
RF

No. 1885 of 1881-82
572

Yukon District. Dy. Commissioner's Office,
Camp Kamaki Gulch, 20th October.

To,

The Secretary to the Minister of Interior
Ottawa Department.

Sir,

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your official Memorandum No. 3285/237 dated the 20th July last, forwarding, for report, a letter from Emanuel Lacé Klondyke & the Rediculi Creek in the Klondyke District & the Bear Lake.

2. In reply, I submit herewith a statement showing briefly the nature and history of the complaint brought against the Petitioner in 1879, and which was withdrawn in August 1880 by Colonel Steele, who has ordered that the family should forfeit the hereditary Claim

3. The appointment of this Gentleman Magistrate was, in accordance with the above order of Colonel Steele, duly recommended, having the selection of a qualified person from amongst the Petitioner's enemies. A Magistrate who has however been nominated, no doubt, with a separate interest, who offered himself as a candidate was claimed to be the Petitioner's opponent, was incompetent to hold

the Office.

4. I take this opportunity of bringing to the notice of the Govt the irregular & unbecoming conduct of certain displaced Chankapuram Peons to hand over charge and disappear before the final accounts, which results in much inconvenience. The aforesaid Ramaswamy, who was removed in April last, absconded and would not hand over charge till the 10th Ultimo, on which date he produced before the Auditor some of the accounts in his possession and pleaded ignorance of the cause of his dismissal. I solicit the orders of the Govt as to the measures to be adopted in cases of this sort.

5. The Canarese records in the case, as per accompanying Index, are enclosed for your reference, and the translation of the Memorandum under reply are herewith returned.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obed. Servant.
Illegible
Asst. Commissioner
Kaveri District.

Statement showing the nature and result of the compli
in the Chancery Suit of the Bella Bank, by the Agent of the said

Number.	Name and Address of Plaintiff.	Name and Address of Defendant.	Nature of the Complaint.	Opinion of
Singh of Ramankalli.	K Shankarpur of the Kankalli Bank. Ramankalli (Gutter)		The 2nd Defendant has ceased from the Exercise of the Government demand, as given at the time of settlement.	The Complainant has ceased his claim to the Government demand. The Amount received with the items of each account granted to differs from the Kindi Bank, the Shankarpur

brought in, & against the Claimant & the Caveat filed

Noble.

the Amiralty. Opinion of the Special Assistant Commissioner. Deputy Commissioner's signed order.

mant has not The alleged release of the
ge that the Plaintiff has not been heard
vered in error, but the conduct of the Plaintiff
vered error: begins (1st Defendant) in
demand; that he greatly founded his
gation in fine; examination of document
the bonds receipts shows that the fabrication
complainant, produced, as Plaintiff in the
Plaintiff in the Admiralty, is not reconciled
to which he agrees with the same as stated in
in exposition the receipts proved by him,
and on a calculation of what
on the amount stated by him
as due, it is found that
has been received in excess
the irregularities on the part
of the Plaintiff that

has in company with his partner (a Plaintiff in Chancery)
rendered by the Assistant Commissioner, summarized
that portion the "Case".

V

Mundeen Kamaraj & Kamaraj. — 120. —	The 2nd Defendant has received from me the sum of Rs demand intimated to me at the Lucas Settlement. The Receipt Book I gave got does not contain the 1st and 6th pages.	A sum of to have been and the Cha on his part from the dis (2nd Defendo The Chandra sponsible for between the Banks in the tions.
Ramaraja & Kasiviswalli. — 120. —	The 2nd Defendant has co: copied in lieu of the demand as intimated at the Lucas Settlement. The Chandra has not given a Receipt Book.	The allega sum has not the Cha blame for no ceipt from
	The Defendant has co: copied in lieu of the	The com that he is in

claimed prosecution, are sufficient to warrant a defendant's punishment being inflicted upon him.

Rs. 2---- seems to have been received in error, that the Chandigue bague's defence has been received and misapplied: that he made entries: finding a sum of Rs. 2---- tion of his father: he and his father have but) is undeniable- joined in practising a de: e is further re:: ception for which he (the De: discrepancies: fendant) is liable. The hindi and Receipt discrepancies between the dates of sending: Khindi and Receipt books disclose a fraudulent con: duct on the part of the Chan: :bague.

receipt of an been passed, bague is to "issuing Re:

The charge brought by the complainant has not been proved, and there is ill-feeling between the Chandigue and the Exti:

ainant state ble to prove

The Chailda's opinion is concurred in.

Sikkim Principality Province Kanchanjanga	Kanchanjanga Peak 28,156 ft. Sikkim Province.	demand not intimated at the Survey Settlement.	No complaint appears to

Owners of Principality Province.

— do. —

exceed Rs. 3.4 — paid by the C
as Received by the Government not credible,
demand against them. has not been

t and the Shan:
not otherwise
guilty.

M Ranchhoddas
for Fourthly Complainant
Karsandas Purshot

complainant is and the complaint proved.

that the evidence of the witness cited by the complainant is not trustworthy may be accepted, I cannot say that the Shanbagas and his father have not been guilty of a fraudulent dealing. The entries in the accounts produced by the Shanbagas are not reliable, and disclose a state of confusion there are strong presumptions of guilt against the Shanbagas, which though not sufficient for a successful

Specially upon the Right, he is, as it were,
surrounded by Mountains (Καταρράκται)
which the River, that it might have room

Bureau

1. Rumpia
2. Tabak

- kg.

Paul Braun & Kunz:
Kenntlich:

3

The Plaintiff's Counsel Mr. Khanna.

-vs-

The Defendant's Counsel Mr. Shankarpure.

The Plaintiff has sue
copied ... from me by pleader; but
Seeks to his demand against
me.

The complai
pleader; but
of the case vi
Defendant, M
Shankarpure,
the conduct
to the Pleader, M
with him was c
in the accom
the Khandi do
with those in
The 1st Defen
for having m
Defendant
the conduct

4

The 2nd Defendant has sue

The evide

that has not been the 1st Defendant having
the circumstances allowed the 2nd to take part
in that the 2nd - in the discharge of his business
& is a licensed car insurance giant car;
per indicated in figures in the accounts. As
the work attached is right for public service
& has in company and should in my opinion
permitted cause be licensed and that
to. The evidence is rejected. It is found
not accepted that an acre of cassava
he might take. has been destroyed, which
that is to blame the plaintiff might to be
lowed the 2nd made to pay to the com;
take part in plaintiff.
of the business.

ce of the widow Said the Civil Law opinion

(General Order No. 29.)

No. 7

1881

OFFICE OF THE
63
31 OCT. 81
120
SECRETARIAT OF MYSORE

From The Deputy Commissioner
Hassan District.

To
The Secretary to the ~~Chief Commissioner~~ Dewan
of Mysore, Revenue Department.

Dated 27th October
Despatched
Received

Enclosures No. 2

General No. 1924 / No. 4 5580 } 1881—82.

Official Memorandum No. 5492/331 dated the 17th Septr 1881, forwarding for report, petition from Rengiah and Ramachandrappa Shanbogues of the Kodihalli Firka in the Belur Taluk.

In returning the Enclosure of the above, has the honor to state that the Petitioners case has been reported upon in this office letter No. 1885/672 of the 20th instant.

Illegible
Dy Commissioner
Hassan District.

30.10.81
Dep - [illegible]

4

(General Series No. 31.)

No 188 2.

From

To Resy Comm.
Hafar &c.

Dated 26th April.

Despatched

Received

Enclosures No. 1 & Papers

General No. 603

No. 34.

Papers on
Petn of Ramachandrion
Cate Shantayne of Kodakal
of Udipur Taluk, Kelan Dt.

Petition Mr.
Read Ends
Ans Ltr
2.5.82

No 8

Madras 1888 / 572 the 20 April /

From the Board of Revenue refording
in the Legislative Department Letter
of Address of Collector of Salem
Letter Copy Civil Criminal Grievance
Petition Removal from office Practice
Sentence Rejection
Conduct Proceedings Enquiry Deposition
Appeal Witness Forgery
Petition Proceedings

No 683 / 34 of 21 April 1888

Sir

I am directed to forward herewith a petition addressed to the Governor in Council by Peter Ramachandriah, a Native Christian of Salem, who was dismissed from the office of Sheristadar of the Court of Small Causes at Salem on the 1st instant, and to request that you will report for the information of Government whether the petitioner has any reason to complain of the manner in which the proceedings which led to his dismissal were conducted.

2. I am to add that the petitioner has been informed that his petition has been forwarded to you for report.

I have &c

The dismissed Shanbogue appears to have been guilty of irregularities which necessitated his removal from office, but they do not appear to have been of so serious a character as to require the deprivation of the family of its right for ever. The Peter Ramachandriah, the brother of the dismissed Shanbogue does not appear to have been in any way concerned in the irregular proceedings of his brother. Under such circumstances, it will be hard to deci